

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,932	09/09/2003	David N. Ku	8537-3	3113
20792 7	590 05/02/2006		EXAMINER	
MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC			WILLSE, DAVID H	
PO BOX 37428	3			
RALEIGH, NC 27627			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3738	
			DATE MAILED: 05/02/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				C		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/658,932	KU, DAVID N.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Dave Willse	3738			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DO SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be the state of	N. imely filed in the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 Fe					
,—	•—	action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	:х рапе Quayle, 1935 С.D. 11, 4	153 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-29 and 34-73</u> is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>8,10-12,27,53-55 and Claim(s)</u> is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-7, 9, 13-26, 28, 29, 34-52, 56-69, and Claim(s)</u> is/are objected to. Claim(s) <u>are subject to restriction and/or </u>	<u>d 70</u> is/are withdrawn from consi nd 71-73 is/are rejected.	deration.			
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)[]	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	epted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex).		
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
2) Noti	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:				

Art Unit: 3738

The present Office action is supplemental to that mailed on April 19, 2006. The shortened statutory period for reply is hereby reset to expire three (3) months from the mailing date of the present Office action. The examiner failed to indicate such on the PTOL-326 form of the prior Office action and thanks the Applicant for calling attention to this oversight on April 27, 2006. The examiner apologizes for the inconvenience to the Applicant. The following is repeated from the prior Office action:

Claims 8, 10-12, 27, 53-55, and 70 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on February 9, 2006.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-7, 9, 13-26, 28, 29, 34-52, 56-69, and 71-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The particular range associated with "a compressive modulus of elasticity less than about 100 megaPascals" (e.g., claim 1, lines 2-3) is not found in the original disclosure, nor is such a range suggested by any disclosed example having a compressive modulus of elasticity of about 100 megaPascals (MPEP § 2163.05). Likewise, the limitation "compressive modulus of elasticity that is between about 1 MegaPascal

Application/Control Number: 10/658,932

Art Unit: 3738

to about 20 MegaPascals" (e.g., claim 48, lines 4-5) is not supported by the original disclosure, especially for the crystalline PVA hydrogel as claimed. In claim 3, line 2, the upper limit neighborhood of "about 5 MPa" (emphasis added) is not believed to have support. In claim 8, line 2, "a compressive modulus of elasticity that is not constant" is not mentioned in the original disclosure. Regarding claim 11, the lower limit neighborhood of "about 1 Newton" (emphasis added) is lacking in the original disclosure. In claim 40, line 3, the negative limitation "plateless" is absent in the original disclosure. Similar problems exist in other claims.

The Applicant has not *specifically* pointed out the support for *every* added claim limitation (MPEP § 714.02). Prior art may be applicable once the above problems have been corrected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Willse whose telephone number is 571-272-4762. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott, can be reached on 571-272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Dave Willse

Primary Examiner

Page 3

Art Unit 3738